



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,542	12/29/2001	Senaka Balasuriya	33692.01.0051	1424

23418 7590 01/29/2003

VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ
222 N. LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

HARPER, V. PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,542

Applicant(s)

BALASURIYA, SENAKA

Examiner

V. Paul Harper

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-11, 13, 15-18 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-11, 13, 15-18, 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 2, 4-6, 13, 15-18, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baruch et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091518 A1), hereinafter referred to as Baruch, in view of Lai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,006,183), hereinafter referred to as Lai.

Regarding claim 23, Baruch discloses a voice control system with multiple speech recognition engines. Baruch's system includes the ability to input a voice command to two recognition engines (abstract, ¶3, ¶10), which corresponds to "providing an audio command to a first speech recognition engine and at least one second speech recognition engine"; and to recognize the command with both recognition engines generating recognition results (¶9), which corresponds to "recognizing the audio command within the first speech recognition engine to generate at least one first recognized audio command, . . . ; and recognizing the audio command

Art Unit: 2654

within the at least one second speech recognition engine, independent of recognizing the audio command by the first speech recognition engine, to generate at least one second recognized audio command,” In addition, Baruch suggests the use of confidence levels (§39) but does not specifically indicate that the two recognizers generate confidence values associated with their individual recognition results. However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai discloses a speech recognition confidence level display that produces a score (confidence level) for each word that is recognized (col. 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing a confidence level with each recognition result, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining the degree of confidence associated with a given recognition event.

In addition, Baruch teaches the choosing between the first recognized result of the first recognition engine and a second recognized result of the second engine (§9), which corresponds to “selecting at least one recognized audio command having a recognized audio command confidence value from the at least one first recognized audio command and the at least one second recognized audio command based on the at least one first confidence value and the at least one second confidence value”; and using the recognizer to choose and transfer a language contained in a database (content server) or information from a device (PDA) over the communications links (§44,

Art Unit: 2654

penultimate sentence, ¶47, Fig. 1, 30, ¶5), which corresponds to “accessing a content server in response to the at least one recognized audio command.”

Regarding claim 2, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1); in addition, Baruch teaches receiving information from a PDA or email handler over a communications link (Fig. 1, 30, ¶5, ¶49), which corresponds to “receiving encoded information from the content server”; and inherently using the information received entailing the decoding of the transferred information (¶49), which corresponds to “decoding the encoded information.”

Regarding claim 4, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2); in addition, Baruch teaches the use of the MESSAGES command that would inherently require access to an external data source over the communications link (¶9, ¶49), which corresponds to “prior to accessing the content server, executing at least one operation based on the at least one recognized audio command..”

Regarding claim 5, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2); in addition, Baruch teaches that the voice controlled apparatus can give user feedback (¶7), which corresponds to “verifying the at least one recognized audio command.”

Regarding claim 6, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 23); in addition, Baruch teaches that if a voice input is not recognized, the system may provide a visual and/or audible message (¶40), which corresponds to “generating an error notification.” But Baruch in view of Lai do not specifically teach that

Art Unit: 2654

this would occur “when the at least one first confidence value and the at least one second confidence value are below a minimum confidence level.” However it is inherent in a system such as Baruch in view of Lai’s where a recognition decision is made based on confidence levels that if the results of both recognition units are below the respective minimum confidence levels, an error would result.

Regarding claim 25, Baruch discloses a voice control system with multiple speech recognition engines. Baruch’s system includes the ability to input a command from a microphone to a recognition engine (abstract, ¶3, ¶10), which corresponds to “a first speech recognition means, operably coupled to an audio subsystem, for receiving an audio command and generating at least one first recognized audio command.” In addition, Baruch suggests the use of confidence values (¶39) but does not specifically indicate “the at least one first recognized audio command has a first confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai discloses a speech recognition confidence level display that produces a score (confidence level) for each word that is recognized (col. 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing a confidence level with each recognition result, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining the degree of confidence associated with a given recognition event.

Baruch’s system includes the ability to input a command from a microphone to a second recognition engine (abstract, ¶3, ¶10, Fig. 1), which corresponds to “a second

Art Unit: 2654

speech recognition means, operably coupled to the audio subsystem, for receiving the audio command and generating, independent of the first speech recognition means, at least one second recognized audio command.” In addition, Baruch suggests the use of confidence values (§39) but does not specifically indicate “each of the at least one second recognized audio command has a second confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai further teaches the production of a score (confidence level) for each word that is recognized (col. 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing a confidence level with each recognition result, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining the degree of confidence associated with a given recognition event.

Baruch's system has a control unit **18** connected directly to the recognition engines (§23) and the ability to choose between the recognition results from the first and second recognizers (§9, Fig. 1), which corresponds to “a means, operably coupled to the first speech recognition means and the second speech recognition means, for receiving the at least one first recognized audio command and the at least one second recognized audio command.” In addition, Baruch teaches: that the recognition engines are connected to a control unit **18** which is connected to the engine association unit **20** and is also connected to the digital communication unit **30** (Fig. 1, **18**), which corresponds to “a dialog manager operably coupled to the first speech recognition means and the second speech recognition means and operably coupleable to a content

Art Unit: 2654

server”; and the recognition results go to the control unit **18** and the result of the speech recognition is used in command and control applications such as the retrieval of messages or data from a PDA (¶3, ¶49), which corresponds to “the dialog manager determines a dialog manager audio command from the at least one recognized command confidence levels and wherein such that the dialog manager access the content server in response to the dialog manager audio command.”

Regarding claim 13, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 25). In addition, Baruch teaches the choosing between a first recognized result of the first engine and a second recognized result of the second engine where the recognition units are coupled to a control unit (¶9, Fig. 1, **18**), which corresponds to “a dialog manager operably coupled to the means for receiving, wherein the means for receiving selects at least one recognized audio command having a recognized confidence value from the at least one first recognized audio command and the at least one second recognized audio command based on the at least one first confidence value and the at least one second confidence value.”

Regarding claim 15, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 25). In addition, Baruch teaches that through voice commands a user can access a list of previously selected languages or email messages (¶44, ¶49), which corresponds to “wherein the dialog manager retrieves encoded information in response to the dialog manager audio command.”

Regarding claim 16, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 15). In addition, Baruch teaches that a list of requested languages

may be provided by loudspeaker (¶44), which corresponds to “a speech synthesis engine operably coupled to the dialog manager, wherein the speech synthesis engine receives speech encoded information from the dialog manager and generates speech formatted information.”

Regarding claim 17, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 16). In addition, Baruch teaches that a speaker 34 is attached to a digital communication unit 30 and a control unit 18, and that this subsystem can generate audio prompts (¶41), which corresponds to “the audio subsystem is operably coupled to the speech synthesis engine, wherein the audio subsystem receives the speech formatted information and provides an output message.”

Regarding claim 18, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 17). In addition, Baruch teaches that if the input is not recognized an audible message may be given (¶41), which corresponds to “the means for receiving provides the dialog manager with an error notification, the output message is an error statement.”

2. Claims 3, 8-11, 21, 22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baruch in view of Lai, and further in view of Baker (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,613).

Regarding claim 3, Baruch in view of Lai teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2), but Baruch in view of Lai do not specifically teach “weighting the at least one first confidence value by a first weight factor and weighting the at least one

Art Unit: 2654

second confidence values by a second weight factor.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Baker.

Baker discloses a voice control system with multiple voice recognition engines where the combining of the recognition results based on the weighting factors (col. 3, 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch in view of Lai by specifically weighing the results from each recognizer, as taught by Baker, for the purpose of assigning a greater weight to the recognizer known to be more accurate (Baker, col. 3, line 42).

Regarding claim 24, Baruch discloses a voice control system with multiple speech recognition engines 10. Baruch’s system includes the ability to input an audio command to two recognition engines (abstract, ¶3, ¶10), which corresponds to “providing an audio command to a terminal speech recognition engine and at least one . . . [additional] speech recognition engine; recognizing the audio command within the terminal speech recognition engine to generate at least one terminal recognized audio command.” Baruch suggests that use of confidence levels (¶39) but does not specifically teach “wherein the at least one terminal [or network] recognized audio command has a corresponding terminal confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai discloses a speech recognition confidence level display and teaches the production of a score (confidence level) for each word that is recognized (col. 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing a confidence level with each recognition result, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining the degree of confidence associated with a given recognition event.

In addition, Baruch does not specifically teach that the second recognizer is a network speech recognition engine. However, the examiner contends that the concept of the use of a second recognizer connected on a network was well known in the art, as taught by Baker.

Barker teaches speech recognition using two recognizers applied to the same input sample, where the second recognizer can be a network device (Fig. 3, Fig. 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing an additional recognizer accessed by a network connection, as taught by Baker, for the purpose of providing access to a more powerful recognizer through a network connection.

In addition, Baruch does not specifically teach the step of "recognizing the audio command within the at least one network speech recognition engine to generate at least one network recognized audio command, wherein the at least one network recognized audio command has a corresponding network confidence value." However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Baker.

Baker further teaches that the output of the network recognizer is assigned a score (or confidence level) (abstract, Fig. 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch in view of Lai, as taught by Baker, to aid in the decision process when selecting from between the recognition candidates.

In addition, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach: the choosing between a first recognized result of the first engine and a second recognized result of the second engine (Baruch, ¶9) where when confidence values are used, as taught above by Lai and Baker, these values would be used in the recognition selection process, which corresponds to "selecting at least one recognized audio command having a recognized audio command confidence value from the at least one terminal recognized audio command and the at least one network recognized audio command"; and using the recognizer to choose and transfer a language contained in a database (content server) or information from a device (PDA) over the communications links (Baruch, ¶44, penultimate sentence, ¶47, Fig. 1, 30, ¶5), which corresponds to "accessing a content server in response to the at least one recognized audio command."

Regarding claim 8, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 24); in addition, Baruch teaches that if a voice input is not recognized the system may provide a visual and/or audible message (¶40), which corresponds to "prior to accessing a content server, generating an error notification." But Baruch in view of Lai and Baker do not specifically teach that this would occur "when the at least one terminal confidence value and the at least one network confidence value are below a minimum confidence level." However, it is inherent in a system such as Baruch in view of Lai's when a recognition decision is made based on

Art Unit: 2654

confidence levels that if the results of both recognition units are below the respective minimum confidence levels, an error would result.

Regarding claim 9, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 24), but Baruch in view of Lai and Baker do not specifically teach “weighting the at least one terminal confidence value by a terminal weight factor and the at least one network confidence value by a network weight factor.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Baker.

Baker further teaches the combining of the recognition results based on the weighting factors (col. 3, 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch in view of Lai and Baker by specifically weighing the results from each recognizer, as taught by Baker, for the purpose of assigning a greater weight to the recognizer known to be more accurate (Baker, col. 3, line 42).

Regarding claim 10, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 24) including the assignment of a confidence level to the recognition events (Lai, col. 2, lines 61-63; Baker, abstract), but Baruch in view of Lai and Baker do not specifically teach “filtering the at least one recognized audio command based on the at least one recognized audio command confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai further discloses the ability to select score thresholds above or below which recognized words are displayed (col. 3, lines 36-40)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch in view of Lai and Baker by specifically supporting the filter capability, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining what the minimum confidence level for recognition will be.

In addition, Baruch teaches the choosing of a command based on the results from the recognizers (§9) where the choice would inherently be the command with the highest confidence, and in a control system such as Baruch's (abstract, §19) the recognized command would inherently be executed, which corresponds to "executing an operation based on the recognized audio command having the highest recognized audio command confidence value."

Regarding claim 11, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 24); in addition Baruch teaches the ability of the system to get confirmation from the user (§50), which corresponds to "verifying the at least one recognized audio command to generate a verified recognized audio command"; and in a control system such as Baruch's (abstract, §19) the execution of the command would inherently follow the affirmation, which corresponds to "executing an operation based on the verified recognized audio command."

Regarding claim 26, Baruch discloses a voice control system with multiple speech recognition engines 10. Baruch's system includes the ability to input an audio command into a microphone 12 connected to a recognition engine (abstract, §3, §10), which corresponds to "a terminal speech recognition engine operably coupled to a microphone and coupled to receive an audio command and generate at least one

terminal recognized audio command.” But Baruch does not specifically teach “wherein the at least one terminal recognized audio command has a corresponding terminal confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Lai.

Lai discloses a speech recognition confidence level display, which indicates the production of a score (confidence level) for each word that is recognized (col. 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing a confidence level with each recognition result, as taught by Lai, for the purpose of determining the degree of confidence associated with a given recognition event.

In addition, Baruch does not specifically disclose “at least one network speech recognition engine operably coupled to the microphone and coupled to receive the audio command and generate at least one network recognized audio command, independent of the terminal speech recognition engine, wherein the at least one network recognized audio command has a corresponding network confidence value.” However, the examiner contends that the concept of the use of a second recognizer connected on a network was well known in the art, as taught by Baker.

Barker teaches speech recognition using multiple recognizers applied to the same input sample, where the second recognizer can be a network device and that a confidence value is associated recognition candidates (abstract, Fig. 3, **315, 309**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baruch by specifically providing an additional recognizer accessed by a network connection, as taught by Baker, for the purpose of providing access to a more powerful recognizer through a network connection.

In addition, Baruch teaches the connecting of the recognition engines to a control unit where the results are send 18, which corresponds to “a comparator operably coupled to the terminal speech recognition engine operably coupled to receive the at least one terminal recognized audio command and further operably coupled to the at least one network speech recognition engine operably coupled to receive the at least one network recognized audio command.”

In addition, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker disclose the choosing between a first recognized result of the first engine and a second recognized result of the second engine (Baruch, ¶19) and where confidence values are used in the recognition selection process, as taught above by Lai and Baker, which corresponds to “a dialog manager operably coupled to the comparator, wherein the comparator selects at least one recognized audio command having a recognized confidence value from the at least one terminal recognized audio command and the at least one network recognized audio command based on the at least one terminal confidence value and the at least one network confidence value.”

Baruch also teaches: the system my require confirmation before proceeding (¶50), which corresponds to “the selected at least one recognized audio command is provided to the dialog manager”; a choice is made in the control unit (dialog manager)

Art Unit: 2654

between the recognition results of two recognizers where a decision rule might be applied based on confidence level (abstract, ¶9, ¶39, ¶50), which corresponds to “a dialog manager audio command determined by the dialog manager from the at least one recognized audio commands based on the at least one recognized audio command confidence levels such that the dialog manager executes an operation in response to the dialog manager audio command” and the control unit 18 is connected to both the engine association unit 20 and the digital communication unit 30 both of which can access databases (¶47-49), which corresponds to “the dialog manager being operably coupleable to a content server such that the operation executed by the dialog manager includes accessing the content server.”

Regarding claim 21, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 26). In addition, Baruch discloses a technique where a user may call up a list of languages or email based on a command (¶44, ¶48-49), which corresponds to “wherein the dialog manager retrieves encoded information from the content server in response to the dialog manager audio command.”

Regarding claim 22, Baruch in view of Lai and Baker teach everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 21). In addition, Baruch discloses a loudspeaker for audible output messages that is connected to the control unit through the digital communications unit (Fig. 1, ¶41), which corresponds to “wherein the speech synthesis engine receives speech encoded information from the dialog manager and generates speech formatted information; and a speaker operably coupled to the speech synthesis

Art Unit: 2654

engine, wherein the speaker receives the speech formatted information and provides an output message.”

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/25/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant asserts on page 7:

It is respectfully submitted that these amendments do not present any new subject matter, and provide for the claimed limitation of inherently contained features of originally presented claims. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the *amendments are not narrowing in nature*, but merely a further delineation of inherently contained features already therein. Should the Examiner feel that this amendment is narrowing in nature, Applicant respectfully requests an express assertion of the Examiner's position. (Italics added)

The Examiner feels that the new claims (23, 24, 25 and 26) that correspond to the deleted claims (1, 7, 12 and 19) with the exception that the new claims contain the additional limitation, “accessing a content server . . .”, do represent a narrowing of the independent claims.

5. Applicant asserts on page 9:

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Baruch in view of Lai, fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of the present claimed invention. Among other things, Baruch fails to disclose "accessing

Art Unit: 2654

a content server in response to at least one recognized audio command." As stated above, Baruch teaches, at best, "dialing a telephone number." (§ 40). The present invention clearly discloses the claimed limitation of accessing a content server, wherein the combination of Baruch and Lai fails to disclose accessing a content server and provide for, at most, dialing a telephone number with the digital communication unit 30, to, access a specific person, or providing an output display unit 32, which is inconsistent with the claimed limitation of, among other things, accessing a content server in response to the at least one recognized audio command."

Baruch teaches that a user may choose a language by uttering its name, which requires the transfer of the language specific data from a database (content server) (§ 44), and in addition, Baruch teaches that one of the voice commands could be MESSAGES, which after recognition would inherently initiate the transfer of email messages from a "content server."

6. Applicant further asserts on page 9:

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Baruch teaches, selecting a selected speech recognition engine, in response to a first recognized audio command, which is inconsistent with the claimed present invention of "accessing a content server."

Baruch teaches choosing between recognition results (§ 10) which is not inconsistent with "accessing a content server," as argued in the previous paragraph.

Applicant asserts on page 9:

In the present Office Action, on page 7, the Examiner asserts that regarding claim 15, "Baruch teaches that through voice commands a user can access a list of previously selected languages where the list may be provided over a loud speaker" (§ 44), which corresponds to "wherein the

dialog manager accesses a content server and retrieves encoded information in response to the dialog manager audio command." Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions made herein and must respectfully disagree. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner-cited passage is inconsistent with the claimed limitation because, *inter alia*, Baruch teaches allowing the user to choose from a list of possible languages in a set-up mode. The only teaching Baruch provides in the Examiner-cited passage consists of verbal navigation commands (e.g. UP or DOWN) or allowing a user to select a language based on the speaking the name of the language. The examiner-cited passage fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, accessing the list of possible languages in response to an audio command and further fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the access of a content server to retrieve this language information.

As the applicant mentions above, Baruch states (§44) that the "user may choose that language by uttering its name." This inherently implies the accessing of a list of languages (for recognition) and, after recognition, the transfer of the language specific data from a data source.

7. Applicant asserts on page 11:

Baker fails to disclose, among other things, *performing any further functions beyond the speech recognition*, than merely providing the output to the display for the user's benefit and/or correction abilities to produce a final written document. (Italics added)

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, these rejections were made with the combination of Baruch in view

Art Unit: 2654

of Lai and Baker, where Baruch specifically discloses a voice **control** system with multiple recognition engines (title), which performs functions after recognition.

8. Applicant further asserts on page 11:

Regarding claims 7 and 19 (currently pending /25 and 26), Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization and the application of the prior art references with regards to the claimed limitations. Among other things, the combination of Baruch, Lai and Baker fail to teach or suggest the limitation of *"accessing a content server in response to the at least one recognized audio command."* As discussed above with regards to claims 23 and 24, Applicant respectfully resubmits that Baruch teaches a system that, upon recognition, either activates another speech recognition engine, provides an output to a display unit, or dials a telephone number with the digital communication unit 30, Lai, upon speech recognition, provides the multiple outputs with their accompanying attributes 110, 120 and 130 to a GUI display 105, and Baker, based upon the speech recognition, provides a visual output on a monitor 305. As such, none of the references, either individually or in combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations. (Italics added)

As argued above in §5, Baruch teaches the use of the MESSAGES command to retrieve email which inherently implies the access of a remote data storage device (i.e., a content server.)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2654

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. V. Paul Harper whose telephone number is (703) 305-4197. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the Technology Center 2600 is (703) 872-9314.

Art Unit: 2654

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

VPH/vph
January 25, 2003

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600